

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/576,989	RICE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zachariah Lucas	1648	

All Participants:

(1) Zachariah Lucas.

(2) David B. Jenkins.

Status of Application: _____

(3) Charles Romano.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 30 March 2005

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
 NA

Claims discussed:
 69, 70, 100, 101

Prior art documents discussed:
 NA

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
 See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Applicant to indicate that the Office considered the claims as presently presented to read on two groups of inventions. These Groups comprise 1) polynucleotides according to claims 1 and 90 and vectors and isolated host cells thereof (claims 1, 3-6, 9, 29, 61, 62, 72, 73, 86-99, 102-107; and claims 69, 70, 100, and 101 in part, inventions indicated to be allowable) and 2) transgenic animals and engrafted host cells comprising such polynucleotides (claims 69, 70, 100, and 101 in part).

In view of the amendment of the claims making explicit the second group of inventions was intended to be within the scope of the claimed inventions, and given that these inventions are generally considered by the Office to be distinct inventions from the basic polynucleotides and isolated host cells comprising such, the Office believes that a restriction between these groups of inventions is now proper. It was indicated that, due to the election by original presentation of group 1 (the previously elected invention), and upon cancellation of the subject matter of Group 2 for prosecution in a later filed application, the claims directed to the inventions of Group 1 would be allowed.

The Applicant agreed to the cancellation of the non-elected subject matter on March 30, 2005 in response to the interview.